

REMARKS

A number of editorial corrections have been made to the specification. Claims 1 - 2, 5, 8, 10 - 18, 20, 22 - 23, 26, 29, 31 - 39, 41, 43 - 44, 47, 50, 52 - 60, and 62 have been amended. Claims 9, 30, and 51 have been cancelled from the application without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced with these corrections or amendments, all of which are supported in the specification as originally filed. Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 29, 31 - 50, and 52 - 63 are now in the application.

I. Proposed Replacement Drawings

As discussed above in "Amendments to the Drawings", proposed replacement drawings are submitted herewith for Figs. 4B and 4C, 6, 7C, 8A, 9B, 10A - 10C, and 12 to correct problems with margins in accordance with the Draftsperson's review. In so doing, Fig. 4B is now split into Figs. 4B1 and 4B2, and Fig. 4C is now split into Figs. 4C1 and 4C2.

The proposed replacement drawings also correct a mistake in Figs. 4B1 and 4C1, substituting the term "medical" for "doctors" in a distinguished name ("DN") element of each figure. With this correction, the figures now align with the corresponding text on Page 46, line 10 of the specification as originally filed.

No new matter is introduced with these proposed replacement drawings, all of which are supported by the specification and drawings as originally filed.

II. Objections to the Specification

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action dated December 23, 2003 (hereinafter, "the Office Action") states that the disclosure is objected to because of the presence of embedded hyperlinks and/or other form of browser-executable code. All references to Web page locations (which were intended only for reference, and not as hyperlinks) have been removed from the specification with the amendments made herein. The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action states that Claims 1 - 12, 14 - 15, 19 - 33, 35 - 36, 40 - 44, 56 - 57, and 61 - 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent 6,585,778 to Hind et al. in view of U. S. Patent 5,937,066 to Gennaro et al. and U. S. Patent 5,933,498 Schneck et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed with reference to the claims as amended herein.

Applicant believes that the claim listing in Paragraph 4 should be Claims 1 - 11, 13 - 14, 19 - 32, 34 - 35, 40 - 53, 55 - 56, and 61 - 63, as several of the listed claims are analyzed in Paragraph 5, rather than Paragraph 4.

Hind teaches use of policy objects, but not policy objects that specify encryption requirements (as in the present invention). According to Hind's teachings, policy objects are used to control the content of a document, such as whether information will be suppressed or altered in

a document that reflects stored information. Thus, users do not receive information for which they are not authorized. Using an example from Hind, if the quantity in stock for some particular item is 28, the policy may indicate that this information can be provided in a document destined for some users, while for other users, the document should only indicate that the item is in stock without specifying any type of quantity information. (See, for example, col. 12, lines 17 - 22, where pseudocode for achieving this result is presented, and col. 14, lines 35 - 38.)

The present invention extends Hind's teachings, as stated in Applicants' specification on p. 25, lines 18 - 21. Policy objects according to the present invention pertain to which users and/or user groups (also referred to as "community members") are authorized to see security-sensitive elements of a document, and what type of encryption is appropriate for encrypting those elements.

With encryption according to the present invention, each authorized user can view the security-sensitive elements for which that user is authorized, even without prior knowledge of the encryption key with which the elements are encrypted, because the document carries key distribution material. At the same time, techniques of the present invention ensure that unauthorized users cannot view the security-sensitive elements. See, for example. p. 11, lines 7 - 11; p. 23, lines 2 - 13; and p. 36, lines 16 - 18, where these advantages are discussed.

Page 31, lines 12 - 16 of Applicants' specification states that documents are not customized for (i.e., are not specially encrypted for) particular requesting users. Instead, the manner in which the keys are created (i.e., the "key distribution material" referenced on line 14) enables "access by any authorized user".

Hind's teachings do not pertain to encryption of document elements, as stated above.

The cited text from col. 7, lines 52 - 67 of Gennaro teaches a double encryption of keys. See lines 53 - 54, "a key (KSTR) is encrypted under two keys (KTR1 and Knode) to form the doubly encrypted key value" and lines 60 - 61, "encrypted first under the key KTR2 and second under the key Knode". Applicants' invention does not perform double encryption of keys.

Applicants have amended their independent Claims 1, 22, and 43 herein to more clearly specify limitations of their invention and to eliminate a number of elements which were overly restrictive. These independent claims now specify that the policy objects specify visibility policy identifying an encryption requirement and a community of authorized viewers. This is not taught by any of the references. The independent claims also specify a limitation of applying style sheet(s) to an input document, thereby adding markup to each document element for which the policy enforcement objects specify a non-null encryption requirement. This limitation is also not taught by the references.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that their amended independent Claims 1, 22, and 43 are clearly patentable over the teachings of Hind, Gennaro, and/or Schneck. For the allowability of dependent Claims 2 - 11, 13 - 14, 19 - 21, 23 - 32, 34 - 35, 40 - 42, 44 - 53, 55 - 56, and 61 - 63, Applicants believe that these claims are allowable by virtue of the allowability of the independent claims from which they depend.

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that Claims 12, 15 - 18, 33, 36 - 39, 54, and 57 - 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind, Gennaro, Schneck and further in view of U. S. Patent 5,787,175 to Carter. Applicants respectfully submit that these dependent claims are allowable by virtue of the allowability of the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection of all claims.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,



Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 25260

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587

Attachments: Replacement Sheets (12)